

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/782,407	02/18/2004	Satoshi Mizutani	20050/0200894-US0	4329	
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 02/12/200 RBY P.C.	7	EXAMINER		
P. O. BOX 525	•		STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F		
NEW TORK,	NY 10150-5257		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			3761		
GWODEN IED GELEURON	Wally on on a page of the				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	02/12/2007	PAF	ER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				Ü			
. ,,,,		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/782,407	MIZUTANI ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jacqueline F. Stephens	3761				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailling date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 N</u>	ovember 2006.	•				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4) 🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-11 and 14-21</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5,12,13,22 and 23</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the l	Examiner.				
. •	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
,.	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applicati	on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen		4) Interview Summary	(PTO 413)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 12, and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4 Claims 1-5, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameo et al. EP 0 88 791.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,407

Art Unit: 3761

As to claims 1-3, 5, 12, and 13 Kameo teaches an pad capable of being positioned in the interlabial space comprising:

an absorbent body 4 for absorbing liquid, the absorbent body including a fiber aggregate of fiber (paragraph 0026); and a cover body 2,3 for covering the absorbent body in an enclosing manner (Figure 2); wherein the fibers are oriented randomly (paragraph 0047). The absorbent body flexural rigidity and ratio of flexural rigidities between the longitudinal or lateral direction and the thickness direction of the absorbent body is taught in the structure taught by Kameo. Kameo discloses an absorbent comprising an absorbent member having a specific structure and elastic member having specific physical properties. Kameo teaches the layers of the absorbent component are positioned to prevent distortion (paragraphs 0029 and 0037). Kameo further teaches randomly oriented fibers so that the absorbent is deformable in conformity with the wearer (paragraph 0047). On pages 7-9, the specification sets forth suitable materials making the absorbent article having the claimed characteristics, namely an average fiber length of 10-51mm (page 7, line 12); random fiber orientation (page 9, lines 16-21); and controlling tensile elongation (page 7, lines 6-7). Kameo teaches similar materials for the absorbent (paragraphs 0047-0052). Kameo teaches the absorbent has an elastic member 7 positioned at a vestibular floor side, which due to its thermoplastic composition and elasticity has a higher tensile elongation than the component 6.

Kameo provides an absorbent constructed in a manner and using materials similar to the claimed invention. Thus, Kameo provides an absorbent capable of achieving the claimed test results. When the structure recited in the reference is

Art Unit: 3761

substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function and the examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has basis for shifting the burden of proof as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980). In the present case, the reference has met the structural requirements of the claims.

It is the examiner's second position that the claimed test characteristics are obvious in the structure provided by Kameo. Kameo teaches the general conditions of the claims, i.e flexural rigidity, randomly oriented fibers, and an absorbent body formed by layering the fiber aggregate and another fiber aggregate that differ from each other in tensile elongation with the aggregate positioned at the vestibular floor side having a higher tensile elongation. Since, the general conditions of the claims are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

The upper and lower sides of the interlabial pad provides the first and second fiber aggregates. Kameo does not provide the claimed vertical height of the first and second fiber aggregate. In *Gardner v. TEC Systems*, *Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984), the Federal Circuit held

Application/Control Number: 10/782,407

Art Unit: 3761

that, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

As to claim 4, Kameo teaches layer 7, which is positioned at the vestibular floor is a mix of synthetic fiber (paragraph 0051). The tensile elongation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by optimizing the type, fineness, and orientation of the fibers. Moreover, discovering optimum values only involves routine skill in the art, *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F. Stephens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jacqueline F Stephens Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3761

February 5, 2007